

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claim 5 has been canceled and claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-14 have been amended to improve their form and clarity. Independent claims 1, 13, and 14 further have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 5. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wilkes (USPGP 2003/0058818) in view of Hodoshima (USPGP 2003/0115339). Applicant submits that the pending claims clearly define over the applied references because these references, even if deemed properly combinable for argument's sake, would not have taught setting the system identification code of a wireless base station different from that of a different wireless base station, as set forth in independent claims 1, 13, and 14.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 14 as presently amended call for recognizing the system identification code (e.g., SSID) for identifying a wireless communication network controlled by another wireless base station in a current wireless base station, and setting the system identification code for the wireless communication network of the current wireless base station different from that of the another wireless base station.

In rejecting claim 5, which is now incorporated in claims 1, 13, and 14, the examiner asserts that Wilkes teaches assigning an IP address that is different from the IP address recognized by the recognizing means. Wilkes indeed discloses assigning an IP address of one based station based on the address automatically assigned by a DHCP server to join the network, or manually sniffing and assigning the IP address to join the network. As Wilkes, however, does not disclose or teach recognizing and setting the SSID of a wireless network, the examiner relied upon Hodoshima for the proposition that recognizing and modifying the SSID would have been obvious, relying on paragraphs 53, 62, 63, and 75 and claim 1 of Hodoshima.

Hodoshima's passages identified by the examiner states nothing about changing the SSID different from the ones recognized. That is, Hodoshima would not have disclosed or taught setting the SSID of the current access point to an SSID that is not in use by any other

recognized access points. Indeed, Hodoshima rather calls for setting the same SSID of other recognized access point(s) to gain a wireless access.

Accordingly, even if the combination were deemed proper for argument's sake, the combination still would not have taught setting the SSID of the current access point to an SSID that is not in use by any other recognized access point, substantially as set forth in the independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-4 and 6-14 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

24 AUGUST 2005

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)